whether to retain or sell the Plan's Interest.

The Department has considered the entire record, including the written comment submitted by the applicant, and has determined to grant the exemption as it was proposed.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Gary H. Lefkowitz of the Department, telephone (202) 219–8881. (This is not a toll-free number.)

General Information

The attention of interested persons is directed to the following:

(1) The fact that a transaction is the subject of an exemption under section 408(a) of the Act and/or section 4975(c)(2) of the Code does not relieve a fiduciary or other party in interest or disqualified person from certain other provisions to which the exemptions does not apply and the general fiduciary responsibility provisions of section 404 of the Act, which among other things require a fiduciary to discharge his duties respecting the plan solely in the interest of the participants and beneficiaries of the plan and in a prudent fashion in accordance with section 404(a)(1)(B) of the Act; nor does it affect the requirement of section 401(a) of the Code that the plan must operate for the exclusive benefit of the employees of the employer maintaining the plan and their beneficiaries;

(2) These exemptions are supplemental to and not in derogation of, any other provisions of the Act and/or the Code, including statutory or administrative exemptions and transactional rules. Furthermore, the fact that a transaction is subject to an administrative or statutory exemption is not dispositive of whether the transaction is in fact a prohibited transaction; and

(3) The availability of these exemptions is subject to the express condition that the material facts and representations contained in each application accurately describes all material terms of the transaction which is the subject of the exemption.

Signed at Washington, D.C., this 6th day of April, 1995.

Ivan Strasfeld,

Director of Exemption Determinations, Pension and Welfare Benefits Administration, Department of Labor.

[FR Doc. 95–8915 Filed 4–11–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–29–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Documents Containing Reporting or Recordkeeping Requirements; Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Review

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).

ACTION: Notice of the OMB review of information collection.

SUMMARY: The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has recently submitted to OMB for review the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

1. Type of submission, new, revised, or extension: Revision.

2. The title of the information collection: Proposed Rules, 10 CFR Part 52, Appendix A, ''Design Certification Rule for the U.S. Advanced Boiling Water Reactor,'' and Appendix B, ''Design Certification Rule for the System 80+ Design.''

13. The form number if applicable: Not applicable.

4. How often is the collection required: Quarterly until the applicant or licensee receives either an operating license under 10 CFR 50, or the Commission makes its findings under 10 CFR 52.103.

5. Who will be required or asked to report: Applicant and holders of construction permits and combined licenses.

6. An estimate of the number of annual respondents: None anticipated in the next three years.

7. An estimate of the number of hours needed annually to complete the requirement or request: For both Appendix A and B, 0 burden hours are anticipated over the next three years. However, when utilized, 8 hours per respondent for reporting will be required.

8. An indication of whether Section 3504(h), Pub. L. 96–511 applies: Applicable.

9. Abstract: The standard design certification rule (10 CFR 52) was codified to establish procedures, standards and criteria governing standard design certification, including informal submittal and recordkeeping requirements. Appendices A–L to Part 52 are reserved to constitute the standard design certification for evolutionary and passive light water reactor design. These proposed rules will certify the Advanced Boiling Water Reactor (ABWR) and System 80+ Standard designs, will be mandatory for those applicants proposing to use Appendix A or B, and will ensure the safety of the public.

Copies of the submittal may be inspected or obtained for a fee from the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street NW. (Lower Level), Washington, DC.

Comments and questions can be directed by mail to the OMB reviewer: Troy Hillier, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (3150–0151), NEOB–10202, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503.

Comments may also be communicated by telephone at (202) 395–3084.

The NRC Clearance Office, is Brenda Jo Shelton, (301) 415–7233.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 6th day of April, 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Gerald F. Cranford,

Designated Senior Official for Information Resources Management.

[FR Doc. 95–8971 Filed 4–11–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

Biweekly Notice

Applications and Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses Involving No Significant Hazards Considerations

I. Background

Pursuant to Public Law 97-415, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission or NRC staff) is publishing this regular biweekly notice. Public Law 97-415 revised section 189 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), to require the Commission to publish notice of any amendments issued, or proposed to be issued, under a new provision of section 189 of the Act. This provision grants the Commission the authority to issue and make immediately effective any amendment to an operating license upon a determination by the Commission that such amendment involves no significant hazards consideration, notwithstanding the pendency before the Commission of a request for a hearing from any person.

This biweekly notice includes all notices of amendments issued, or proposed to be issued from March 17, 1995, through March 31, 1995. The last biweekly notice was published on March 29, 1995 (60 FR 16181).

Notice Of Consideration Of Issuance Of Amendments To Facility Operating Licenses, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, And Opportunity For A Hearing

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the following amendment requests involve

no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The basis for this proposed determination for each amendment request is shown below.

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice will be considered in making any final determination.

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendment until the expiration of the 30-day notice period. However, should circumstances change during the notice period such that failure to act in a timely way would result, for example, in derating or shutdown of the facility, the Commission may issue the license amendment before the expiration of the 30-day notice period, provided that its final determination is that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will consider all public and State comments received before action is taken. Should the Commission take this action, it will publish in the Federal Register a notice of issuance and provide for opportunity for a hearing after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

Written comments may be submitted by mail to the Rules Review and Directives Branch, Division of Freedom of Information and Publications Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, and should cite the publication date and page number of this Federal Register notice. Written comments may also be delivered to Room 6D22, Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland from 7:30 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. Federal workdays. Copies of written comments received may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC. The filing of requests for a hearing and petitions for leave to intervene is discussed below.

By May 12, 1995, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license and any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding and who wishes to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written request for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene. Requests for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's ''Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings'' in 10 CFR Part 2. Interested persons should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.714 which is available at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC and at the local public document room for the particular facility involved. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, designated by the Commission or by the Chairman of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the designated Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of a hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR 2.714, a petition for leave to intervene shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding, and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) the nature of the petitioner's right under the Act to be made a party to the proceeding; (2) the nature and extent of the petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; and (3) the possible effect of any order which may be entered in the proceeding on the petitioner's interest. The petition should also identify the specific aspect(s) of the subject matter of the proceeding as to which petitioner wishes to intervene. Any person who has filed a petition for leave to intervene or who has been admitted as a party may amend the petition without requesting leave of the Board up to 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, but such an amended petition must satisfy the specificity requirements described above.

Not later than 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, a petitioner shall file a supplement to the petition to intervene which must include a list of the contentions which are sought to be litigated in the matter. Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the petitioner shall provide a brief explanation of the bases of the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion which support the contention and on which the petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The petitioner must also provide references to those specific sources and documents of which the petitioner is aware and on which the petitioner intends to rely to establish those facts or expert opinion. Petitioner must provide sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendment under consideration. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle the petitioner to relief. A petitioner who fails to file such a supplement which satisfies these requirements with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

Those permitted to intervene become parties to the proceeding, subject to any limitations in the order granting leave to intervene, and have the opportunity to participate fully in the conduct of the hearing, including the opportunity to present evidence and cross-examine witnesses.

If a hearing is requested, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will serve to decide when the hearing is held.

If the final determination is that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration, the Commission may issue the amendment and make it immediately effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing held would take place after issuance of the amendment.

If the final determination is that the amendment request involves a significant hazards consideration, any hearing held would take place before the issuance of any amendment.

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Attention: Docketing and Services Branch, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington DC, by the above date. Where petitions are filed during the last 10 days of the notice period, it is requested that the petitioner promptly so inform the Commission by a toll-free telephone call to Western Union at 1-(800) 248-5100 (in Missouri 1-(800) 342-6700). The Western Union operator should be given Datagram

Identification Number N1023 and the following message addressed to (Project Director): petitioner's name and telephone number, date petition was mailed, plant name, and publication date and page number of this Federal Register notice. A copy of the petition should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, and to the attorney for the licensee.

Nontimely filings of petitions for leave to intervene, amended petitions, supplemental petitions and/or requests for a hearing will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer or the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that the petition and/or request should be granted based upon a balancing of factors specified in 10 CFR 2.714(a)(1)(i)-(v) and 2.714(d).

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room for the particular facility involved.

Commonwealth Edison Company, Docket Nos. STN 50-454 and STN 50-455, Byron Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Ogle County, IllinoisDocket Nos. STN 50-456 and STN 50-457, Braidwood Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Will County, Illinois

Date of amendment request: March 23, 1994, as supplemented on July 26, 1994, February 15, 1995, and February 28, 1995.

Description of amendment request: In the submittals of March 23 and July 26, 1994, the licensee requested revisions to the plants' technical specifications (TSs) to permit the use of a slightly positive reactor core moderator temperature coefficient (MTC). The February 15, 1995, submittal requested approval to expand the operating limits report (OLR) to include a cycle specific MTC value and requested approval to maintain the MTC value within the limits specified in the OLR. The maximum upper MTC limit would be specified in the TSs. The February 28, 1995, submittal provided a revised Significant Hazards Consideration. This supplements the information that was published in the Federal Register on August 31, 1994 (59 FR 45037).

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. The proposed changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

An analysis program was pursued by Commonwealth Edison to justify a positive MTC, reduced reactor coolant system thermal design flow, and increased steam generator tube plugging levels. This analysis identified a need for corresponding increases in the boron concentration levels in the refueling water storage tank (RWST) and safety injection accumulators to assure subcriticality requirements are met following a postulated loss-of-coolant accident (LOCA). The increases in boron concentration are based on the maximum upper limit of the MTC. The corresponding Technical Specification changes required as a result of this analysis program were previously approved by the NRC, including the increases in boron concentration limits, with the exception of the positive MTC change. The safety analyses necessary to support this program are documented in WCAP-13964. The results were reviewed by Commonwealth Edison and found to be acceptable. All Departure from Nucleate Boiling Ratio (DNBR) design limits were determined such that there was a 95 percent probability at a 95 percent confidence level that DNB would not occur on the most limiting fuel rod for any Condition I or Condition II event. The present Technical Specification limit for Nuclear Enthalpy Rise Hot Channel Factor, ... , of less than 1.65 ensures that the DNB design basis stated above would be met, thus fuel integrity will not be challenged.

The accidents which are sensitive to MTC were analyzed as part of the overall program and the results were found to be acceptable. The safety functions of the evaluated systems and components remain unchanged. The analysis performed using the increased MTC value does not affect the integrity of the safety related systems and components such that their function to control radiological consequences is affected and all fission barriers will remain intact. The effects on offsite doses have been considered. The incorporation of a positive MTC, in conjunction with the previously approved reduction in reactor coolant system thermal design flow rate and increase in steam generator tube plugging levels, will result in a small increase in offsite doses; however, the total doses remain a small fraction of the 10 CFR 100 limits. As such, the accident analysis acceptance criteria continue to be satisfied.

On a cycle-by-cycle basis, a deterministic evaluation of the impact on ATWS risk will be performed. An Unfavorable Exposure Time (UET) will be calculated, where UET is defined as the amount of time during the operating cycle for which the reactivity feedback is not sufficient to prevent Reactor Coolant System (RCS) pressure from exceeding 3200 psig for a given plant configuration. The UET methodology is consistent with the Westinghouse Owner's Group methodology presented in WCAP 11992, ''ATWS Rule Administration Process'' and WCAP 11993, ''Assessment of Compliance with ATWS Rule Basis for Westinghouse PWRs''. Corrective actions will be taken, as necessary, to assure a UET of less than 5 percent of cycle length.

The relocation of the cycle-specific core operating limits for the MTC from the Technical Specifications has no influence or impact on the probability or consequences of any accident previously evaluated. Byron and Braidwood Stations will continue to operate within the cycle-specific MTC limits contained in the OLR. The proposed amendment will require exactly the same action to be taken when the OLR limits are exceeded as are required by the current Technical Specification. Any change to the MTC values in the OLR will be performed based on NRC-approved methodology as delineated in Section 6.9.1.9 of the Technical Specifications. Each accident analysis addressed in the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR) will be examined with respect to changes in cycle dependent parameters, which are obtained from application of NRC-approved reload design methodologies, to ensure that the transient evaluation of new reloads are bounded by previously accepted analysis. This examination, which will be performed under the requirements of 10 CFR 50.59, ensures that future reloads will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

Therefore, implementation of a positive MTC will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. The proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different type of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The methodology and manner of plant operation as a result of the proposed changes is unaffected. Implementation of a positive MTC does not impact the safe operation of the reactor provided that the Limiting Conditions for Operation (LCOs) and the associated action requirements are satisfied. The assumptions do not create any new failure modes that could adversely impact safety related equipment. The reload safety limits and LCOs in the plant Technical Specifications will be evaluated and satisfied for each future reload core design via the 10 CFR 50.59 process. All DNBR limits have been satisfied. Currently installed equipment will not be operated in a manner different than previously designed. No new credible limiting single failure has been created. No new or different accidents or failure modes have been identified for any systems or components important to safety.

The relocation of the cycle specific MTC values to the OLR will not create the possibility of a new or different type of accident. No safety related equipment or safety function will be altered as a result of this proposed change. The cycle specific values are calculated using NRC-approved methods and submitted to the NRC to allow the Staff to continue to trend these limits. The Technical Specifications will continue to require operation within the analyzed core operating limits and appropriate actions will be taken, when, or if, the limits are exceeded.

Therefore, there is not a potential for creating the possibility of a new or different type of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. The proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The performance and integrity of the evaluated safety related systems and components are not affected by the proposed change to the MTC. The radiological consequences of all previously analyzed accidents remain within acceptable limits. The proposed change to the MTC will have no effect on the availability, operability, or performance of the evaluated safety related systems or components. The incorporation of a positive MTC, in conjunction with the previously approved reduction in reactor coolant system thermal design flow rate and increase in steam generator tube plugging levels, will result in a small increase in offsite doses; however, the total doses remain a small fraction of the 10CFR100 limits. The methodology, discussed in Attachment E, describes the determination and use of the UET values in the calculation of the Primary Pressure Relief node for the ATWS event tree to determine an overall ATWS risk value. The methodology will be used by ComEd to ensure that a core designed with a positive MTC will not result in an unacceptable risk to core damage frequency due to an ATWS event. The margin of safety associated with the licensing basis safety analysis is not significantly reduced by the proposed changes. All acceptance criteria for the specific UFSAR Chapter 15 safety analyses (non-LOCA and LOCA) have been satisfactorily evaluated and verified using NRC approved methodologies.

The margin of safety is not affected by the relocation of the cycle specific MTC limits from the Technical Specifications. The proposed amendment continues to require operation within the core limits as determined by the NRC-approved reload design and safety analysis methodologies. Appropriate actions will be taken, when, or if, limits are exceeded.

The development of the MTC limits for future reloads will continue to conform to those methods described in the NRC-approved documentation. In addition, each future reload will involve a 10 CFR 50.59 safety review to assure that operation of the unit within the cycle specific limits will not involve a reduction in the margin of safety as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification.

Therefore, there is no significant reduction in the margin of safety as defined in the bases of any Technical Specification.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the requested amendments involve no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: For Byron, the Byron Public Library, 109 N. Franklin, P.O. Box 434, Byron, Illinois 61010; for Braidwood, the Wilmington Township Public Library, 201 S. Kankakee Street, Wilmington, Illinois 60481.

Attorney for licensee: Michael I. Miller, Esquire; Sidley and Austin, One First National Plaza, Chicago, Illinois 60690

NRC Project Director: Robert A. Capra

Consumers Power Company, Docket No. 50-255, Palisades Plant, Van Buren County, Michigan

Date of amendment request: October 20, 1992

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would comply with the requirements of Amendment 135 to the Palisades Operating License, dated February 11, 1991, which included a change to Technical Specification 5.3.1a, Primary Coolant System. The safety evaluation for Amendment 135 included a requirement that changes to Section 4.2 of the Palisades Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR) be made through a formal amendment process. The proposed FSAR change is a result of the steam generator replacement project and includes the following: (1) deletion of a design load since this was not treated as a necessary design condition in the new steam generators; (2) a change in the feedwater temperature from 70°F to 40°F, since this assumption was changed in the analysis for the replacement steam generators; and (3) editorial changes.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

The following summary supports the finding that the proposed change would not:

1. Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The probability of an accident previously evaluated in the FSAR will not be increased by deleting the design load change of 15% per minute or decreasing the minimum feedwater temperature from 70°F to 40°F. There is no design requirement that the plant be capable of 15% per minute load changes. No accident has as an initial condition a 15% per minute load change taking place, and since this FSAR change is the result of the replacement steam generators design, no accident probabilities are increased. The 40°F feedwater temperature affects the steam generators, but nothing else is affected in the primary coolant system (PCS). The replacement steam generators have been shown by the design analysis report to be able to withstand the same number of cycles of the addition of 40°F water as the old steam generators could with 70°F water.

The consequences of an accident previously evaluated in the FSAR are not increased by either of these two changes. Deleting the design load rate of 15% per minute deals with normal plant operation and would not affect the course of a Chapter 14 event since none of the Chapter 14 events involve power level changes with respect to the steam generators. Also, reducing the maximum design load change rate is a conservative change.

Lowering the feedwater temperature could increase the consequences of the main steam line break (MSLB) accident by increasing the likelihood of a return to power event caused by increased core cooling; however, the current FSAR analysis in Section 14.14 used 32°F as the auxiliary feedwater temperature and thus bounds [the] 40°F [temperature].

2. Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The possibility of a new or different type of accident is not created by these FSAR changes. By deleting the 15% per minute load change rate from the FSAR, the operation of the plant is unaffected because the 5% per minute limit on load rate change is more limiting. There is no license requirement to be able to change power at 15% per minute except as described in the proposed FSAR deletion. Furthermore, FSAR Section 4.3.7.2 states that the pressurizer heaters cannot be uncovered by the outward surge of water following load increases; a 10% step increase and 15% ramp increase. FSAR Section 1.2.4.9.a states that the nuclear steam supply system (NSSS) is capable of a ramp change from 15% to 100% power at 5% per minute, and at a greater rate over smaller load changes up to a step change of 10%.

Another consideration is that the analysis for the original steam generators was not as detailed or exact as the analysis for the replacement steam generators. The thermal analysis section of the original steam generator design analysis report states for the three power change cases, 5% per minute, 15% per minute and a 10% step change, that ''... the transient thermal effects of the power changes are small and [negligible]. The situations of significance are due to cycling between steady state conditions at different power levels.'' Thus, the rate of change was not a consideration in the original design analysis. The replacement steam generator analysis calculated the transient temperature changes with respect to time, so the rate of change was considered. Therefore, the replacement steam generator analysis is more accurate, but does not consider a 15% per minute rate change. The original steam generators were not designed for 15% per minute power changes but could withstand power increases from 50% to 100% [a total of] 15,000 times without considering the rate of power change.

Reducing the analyzed feedwater temperature from 70°F to 40°F does not change the possibility of whether another type of accident or malfunction can occur since the steam generator is analyzed for this.

3. Involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The margin of safety as defined by plant licensing basis is not reduced due to the replacement steam generators not being analyzed for a 15% per minute power ramp

because the 15% per minute ramp rate was not a licensing basis of the plant design. The original plant Safety Evaluation Report does not mention the design power ramp rates. The basis for Technical Specification 3.1.2 states that all components are designed to withstand the effects of cyclic loads due to primary coolant system temperature and pressure changes induced by load changes, trips, and start-ups and shutdowns. FSAR Section 4.2.2 is referenced. The change of eliminating the analyzed ability to make 15% per minute power changes does not reduce the margin of safety because:

a. the plant is not operated in a manner wherein 15% per minute power increases are made. Rapid power decreases during emergency conditions are not covered by this analysis since they are not controlled to 15% per minute but should be considered analyzed by the 500 trips or 10% step change analysis and,

b. the original steam generator did not use the ramp rate in the analysis and,

c. a 15% per minute power change from 50% to 100% power is a fairly benign change for the steam generator with respect to pressure and temperature changes as compared to heatups and cooldowns because the total changes are small.

The only requirement from the NRC with respect to the number and type of loads is contained in Section II of the NRC Standard Review Plan (SRP) 3.9.1 which states ''...The section of the applicant's SAR which pertains to transients will be acceptable if the transient conditions selected for equipment fatigue evaluation are based upon a conservative estimate of the magnitude and frequency of the temperature and pressure conditions resulting from those transients.'' ''... Transients and resulting loads and load combinations with appropriate specified design and service limits must provide a complete basis for design of the reactor coolant pressure boundary for all conditions and events expected over the service lifetime of the plant.''

In the intervening years between design of the original steam generators and the replacement steam generators, Combustion Engineering (ABB-CE) decided that a 15% per minute power ramp rate was beyond what was necessary and expected to occur. This position was acceptable to the NRC since ABB-CE letter CPC-90-170, dated October 24, 1990, states that the replacement steam generators are identical in design to the Palo Verde (Arizona Public Service) steam generators. (The ABB-CE letter was concerned with the stress analysis for steam line breaks, therefore, the reference to being identical was with respect to that stress analysis.)

The change in feedwater temperature from 70°F to 40°F maintains the margin of safety because the replacement steam generators have been shown by the design analysis report to be able to withstand the same number of cycles of the addition of 40°F water as the old steam generators could 70°F water.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Van Wylen Library, Hope College, Holland, Michigan 49423.

Attorney for licensee: Judd L. Bacon, Esquire, Consumers Power Company, 212 West Michigan Avenue, Jackson, Michigan 49201

NRC Project Director: Cynthia A. Carpenter, Acting

Detroit Edison Company, Docket No. 50-341, Fermi-2, Monroe County, Michigan

Date of amendment request: September 13, 1993

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would relocate audit frequencies of Section 6.5.2.8 of the Technical Specifications to the Quality Assurance Program in Section 17.2 of the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

The proposed change to relocate the audit program frequency requirements to the Quality Assurance Program does not:

(1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated,

This change is administrative in nature and does not impact the operation of the plant or the plant's response to an accident. Because it will allow more flexibility in assigning resources to assess weak or declining performance areas, the plant safety performance will be improved.

(2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated,

This change is administrative in nature and does not affect the operation or design of the plant; therefore, there is no change in the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

(3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

This change is administrative in nature and does not affect the operation of the plant; therefore, there is no change in the margin of safety. Relocating the audit program frequency requirements to the Quality Assurance program will allow a more dynamic and responsive audit program. Audits will be able to be scheduled more effectively based on performance and the status of related activities. This should result in a more effective audit program that will contribute to an improvement in safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Monroe County Library System, 3700 South Custer Road, Monroe, Michigan 48161

Attorney for licensee: John Flynn, Esq., Detroit Edison Company, 2000 Second Avenue, Detroit, Michigan 48226

NRC Project Director: Cynthia A. Carpenter, Acting

Entergy Operations, Inc., Docket Nos. 50-313 and 50-368, ArkansasNuclear One, Unit Nos. 1 and 2 (ANO-1&2), Pope County, Arkansas

Date of amendment request: August 30, 1994, with supplement dated January 19, 1995.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment changes requirements related to the site parimeter security system.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, excerpts of this analysis are presented below:

Criterion 1 - Does Not Involve a Significant Increase in the Probability or Consequences of an Accident Previously Evaluated

The accident mitigation features of the plant are not affected by the proposed change. This change provides an equivalent level of protection as required by 10CFR73.55(c)(4), does not significantly decrease the effectiveness of the security program, and is adequate for preventing an unacceptable risk to public health and safety. Ample protection against a design basis security threat continues to be provided. Therefore, the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated is not significantly increased.

Criterion 2 - Does Not Create the Possibility of a New or Different Kind of Accident from Any Previously Evaluated

This change clarifies the existing configuration of the protected area barrier at the ANO intake structure. New systems, modes of equipment operation, failure modes, or other plant perturbations are not introduced by this change. Therefore, the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from amy previously evaluated is not created.

Criterion 3 - Does Not Involve a Significant Reduction in the Margin of Safety

This change clarifies the existing configuration of the protected area barrier at the ANO intake structure. The proposed change does not alter a safety limit, a limiting condition of operation, or a surveillance requirement on equipment to operate the plant. Adequate physical protection of the plant is maintained. Therefore, the margin of safety is not significantly reduced.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Tomlinson Library, Arkansas Tech University, Russellville, AR 72801

Attorney for licensee: Nicholas S. Reynolds, Esquire, Winston and Strawn, 1400 L Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20005-3502

NRC Project Director: William D. Beckner

IES Utilities Inc., Docket No. 50-331, Duane Arnold Energy Center (DAEC), Linn County, Iowa

Date of amendment request: March 1, 1995

Description of amendment request: The proposed License Amendment would revise Technical Specification (TS) Sections 4.5 and 4.8 of the DAEC TS to reflect the changes to pump and valve testing criteria. The proposed amendment changes the testing frequency for certain pumps and valves in the Low Pressure Coolant Injection subsystem; Core Spray subsystems; and the Residual Heat Removal Service Water, High Pressure Coolant Injection, Emergency Service Water, and River Water Supply systems. The frequency would change from testing every three months to that specified by DAEC ASME Section XI Inservice Testing (IST) program.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

(1) The affected pumps and valves in Sections 4.5 and 4.8 will continue to be tested in accordance with ASME Section XI OM-6 and OM-10. The affected pumps and valves will continue to function as before and this change will not result in a decrease in their availability to mitigate the consequences of certain accidents and transients. The proposed amendment will not affect the consequences of these accidents and transients. Therefore, the

proposed amendment does not involve a change in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

(2) The proposed license amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated. The safety functions of the affected pumps and valves will remain unchanged. This amendment will result in no physical changes to the affected pumps, valves or systems. Consequently, the proposed license amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

(3) The proposed amendment will not reduce the margin of safety. The actual operation of the affected pumps and valves will remain unchanged. Testing in accordance with ASME Section XI OM-6 and OM-10 will continue to provide assurance that degradation in tested components will be detected and addressed.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on thisreview, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Cedar Rapids Public Library, 500 First Street, S.E., Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52401

Attorney for licensee: Jack Newman, Kathleen H. Shea, Morgan, Lewis & Bockius, 1800 M Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20036-5869NRC Acting Project Director: Gail H. Marcus

Northeast Nuclear Energy Company, et al., Docket No. 50-423, Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 3, New London County, Connecticut

Date of amendment request: January 24, 1995, as supplemented March 22, and March 29, 1995.

Description of amendment request: The amendment request would revise the Technical Specification Section 3.2.3.1.a and Table 2.2-1 to decrease the acceptance criterion for measured reactor coolant system (RCS) flow rate from 387,480 gallons per minute (gpm) to 371,920 gpm.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration (SHC), which is presented below:

...The proposed changes do not involve an SHC because the changes would not:

1. Involve a Significant Increase in the Probability or Consequence of an Accident Previously Evaluated.

An evaluation of the 4% decrease in the RCS total flow rate limit has shown that the change does not significantly impact the design basis analyses. Therefore, the change will not increase the consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

There are no actual plant changes that will result from this technical specification change. Instead, the technical specification requirement for minimum total RCS flow rate is being changed to provide operational benefit without compromising safety. Since there are no plant changes, there is no effect on the probability of occurrence of previously evaluated accidents.

The change will have a negligible impact on the small break loss of coolant accident (LOCA) and large break LOCA analyses. The PCT [peak cladding temperature] acceptance criteria will continue to be met with the assumption of a 4% reduction in RCS flow rate.

For the steam generator tube rupture event, both the FSAR [Final Safety Analysis Report] offsite dose analysis and the margin of steam generator (SG) overfill were evaluated. It was determined that the 4% reduction in RCS flow rate will not adversely affect the offsite doses or the margin to SG overfill and, therefore, the FSAR conclusions remain unchanged.

In the evaluation of non-LOCA transients, the DNB [departure from nucleate boiling] is the most affected parameter due to a change in flow rate. It was concluded that the 4% reduction in RCS flow was acceptable and there was margin to the DNB limit.

It is concluded that there is sufficient margin to the system pressure, PCT and DNB limits to offset the effect of the 4% flow rate decrease and the calculated radiological releases associated with the analysis are not affected. Therefore, there is no effect on the consequences of previously evaluated accidents.

2. Create the Possibility of a New or Different Kind of Accident from any Previously Evaluated.

The low loop flow trip setpoint specified in Technical Specification Table 2.2-1 is set as a fraction of total flow. The flow fraction is not being changed and no hardware changes are required due to the reduction in minimum flow. Also, the reduction in minimum flow will not change the operation of any plant equipment and it does not modify plant operation.

Therefore, the reduction in minimum flow does not introduce any new failure modes or malfunctions and it does not create the potential for a new unanalyzed accident.

3. Involve a Significant Reduction in the Margin of Safety.

The proposed 4% decrease in the technical specification limit for total RCS flow rate will not adversely affect the results of the FSAR accident analysis, and it is concluded that this change is safe. The change does not adversely affect any equipment credited in the safety analysis, and it does not affect the probability of occurrence of any plant accident. Also, the change has a negligible impact on the PCT, and it does not increase the offsite doses or decrease the DNB below its acceptance limit.

Therefore, the change does not have any significant impact on the protective boundaries, and there is no reduction in the margin of safety as specified in the technical specifications.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Learning Resource Center, Three Rivers Community-Technical College, Thames Valley Campus, 574

New London Turnpike, Norwich, CT 06360.

Attorney for licensee: Ms. L. M. Cuoco, Senior Nuclear Counsel, Northeast Utilities Service Company, Post Office Box 270, Hartford, CT 06141-0270.

NRC Project Director: Phillip F. McKee

Omaha Public Power District, Docket No. 50-285, Fort Calhoun Station,Unit No. 1, Washington County, Nebraska

Date of amendment request: March 1, 1995

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment to the technical specifications (TS) would make administrative changes to TS 2.5, 2.8, 2.11, 3.2, and 3.10 and, in accordance with Generic Letter (GL) 93-07, ''Modification of the Technical Specification Administrative Control Requirements for Emergency and Security Plans,'' to TS 5.5 and 5.8.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

(1) The proposed changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed revisions to Technical Specifications (TS) 5.5 and 5.8 are administrative in nature and follow the guidance of Generic Letter (GL) 93-07. The review and audit functions of the site security and emergency plans and procedures will be retained in a manner that fully satisfies regulatory requirements. Therefore, the proposed revisions do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed revision to TS 2.5 will still require backup water for the emergency feedwater storage tank to be available. However, several other available sources of water are preferred over river water, such as, the water plant demineralized water system and the outside condensate storage tank. Therefore, the proposed revision does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed deletion of TS 2.8(8) pertaining to fuel handling cranes, deletion of TS 2.11 pertaining to overhead cranes in the Containment and Auxiliary Buildings, and deletion of statements in the bases of TS 2.8 pertaining to crane interlocks does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. Specifications 2.8(8), 2.11 and the deleted statements in the bases of Specification 2.8 need not be retained in the TS based upon Criteria 1 through 4 of the ''Final Policy Statement on Technical Specifications Improvements for Nuclear Power Reactors,'' dated July 22, 1993 (58 FR 39132).

Controls and limitations for the operation and testing of these cranes and interlocks will be incorporated into the Updated Safety Analysis Report (USAR). The requirements of TS 2.8(8) and restrictions of TS 2.11 are currently contained in Station procedures to ensure that the handling of fuel assemblies, control element assemblies (CEAs) and heavy loads is accomplished safely and effectively. These revisions make the FCS Technical Specifications more similar to Standard Technical Specifications (STS), which do not contain requirements or restrictions concerning the operation of fuel handling cranes or overhead cranes.

The revision proposed for TS 3.2, Table 3-5, Item 1 will make its surveillance frequency identical to the frequency specified in STS 3.1.5.7. The proposed frequency will require testing CEA drop times prior to reactor criticality after each removal of the reactor vessel closure head, which is the most appropriate time to perform the surveillance. The proposed frequency will ensure that the CEAs drop into the core within the time specified in the safety analysis and, therefore, does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed deletion of TS 3.2, Table 3-5, Item 5, which currently requires testing refueling system interlocks prior to the refueling outage does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. Table 3-5, Item 5, does not need to be retained in the TS based upon Criteria 1 through 4 of the ''Final Policy Statement on Technical Specifications Improvements for Nuclear Power Reactors,'' dated July 22, 1993. Controls and limitations for testing the refueling system interlocks will be incorporated into the USAR. The requirements for testing refueling system interlocks are already contained in Station procedures. This revision makes the FCS Technical Specifications more similar to STS, which do not contain requirements or restrictions pertaining to testing refueling system interlocks.

The proposed revision to TS 3.2, Table 3-5, Item 10, ensures consistent use of terminology among the frequencies specified in Table 3-5. The proposed revision clarifies the wording and introduces additional operational flexibility such that the surveillance could be performed before 720 hours of system operation, if warranted by plant conditions or beneficial to plant operation. Therefore, the proposed revision does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The remaining TS revisions are administrative in nature in that they correct references, titles, misspelling(s), and page numbers, or revise wording to be consistent with defined intervals within the TS. Therefore, they do not increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. None of the proposed TS revisions will impact the function or method of operation of plant systems, structures, or components.

(2) The proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The proposed revisions to TS 5.5 and 5.8 which delete the review and/or audit of the emergency, site security and safeguards contingency plans and implementing procedures from the TS are administrative in nature and in accordance with the guidance of GL 93-07. The proposed revisions will not affect the operation of any system, structure, or component and therefore do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The proposed revision to TS 2.5 will still require a backup supply of water for the emergency feedwater storage tank to be available. However, several other available sources of water are preferred over river water, such as, the water plant demineralized water system and the outside condensate storage tank. Therefore, the proposed revision does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The proposed deletion of TS 2.8(8) pertaining to fuel handling cranes, deletion of TS 2.11 pertaining to overhead cranes in the Containment and Auxiliary Buildings and deletion of statements in the bases of TS 2.8 pertaining to crane interlocks does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. Specifications 2.8(8), 2.11 and the deleted statements in the bases of Specification 2.8 need not be retained in the TS based upon Criteria 1 through 4 of the ''Final Policy Statement on Technical Specifications Improvements for Nuclear Power Reactors,'' dated July 22, 1993.

The requirements of TS 2.8(8) and restrictions of TS 2.11 are currently contained in Station procedures to ensure that the handling of fuel assemblies, CEAs and heavy loads is accomplished safely and effectively. These revisions make the FCS Technical Specifications more similar to STS, which do not contain requirements or restrictions concerning the operation of fuel handling cranes or overhead cranes.

The proposed revision to TS 3.2, Table 3-5, Item 1, is an administrative revision to the frequency of CEA drop time testing. The proposed frequency is the most appropriate time to perform the surveillance to ensure that the CEAs drop into the core within the time specified in safety analysis and is identical to the frequency specified in STS 3.1.5.7. Therefore, the proposed revision does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The proposed deletion of TS 3.2, Table 3-5, Item 5, which currently requires testing the refueling system interlocks prior to the refueling outage, does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. Table 3-5, Item 5, does not need to be retained in the TS based upon Criteria 1 through 4 of the ''Final Policy Statement on Technical Specifications Improvements for Nuclear Power Reactors,'' dated July 22, 1993. The requirements for testing refueling

system interlocks are currently contained in Station procedures. This revision makes the FCS Technical Specifications more similar to STS, which do not contain requirements or restrictions pertaining to testing refueling system interlocks.

The proposed revision to TS 3.2, Table 3-5, Item 10, ensures consistent use of terminology among the frequencies specified in Table 3-5. The proposed revision clarifies the wording and introduces additional operational flexibility such that the surveillance could be performed before 720 hours of system operation, if warranted by plant conditions or beneficial to plant operation. Therefore, the proposed revision does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

The remaining TS revisions are administrative in nature in that they correct references, titles, misspelling(s), and page numbers, or revise wording to be consistent with defined intervals within the TS. Therefore, they do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident.

(3) The proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The proposed revisions to TS 5.5 and 5.8 concerning the review and/or audit of the emergency, site security and safeguards contingency plans and implementing procedures do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The audit and review processes are administrative functions which will be retained outside the TS in a manner that fully satisfies regulatory requirements.

Removing the requirement of TS 2.5 that Missouri River water from the fire water system shall be available to provide a backup water supply to the emergency feedwater storage tank improves operational flexibility without reducing any safety margins. Better sources of backup water are available to replenish the emergency feedwater storage tank. Although deleted from TS 2.5, the fire water system is still required to be available to meet the requirements of paragraph 3.F of the FCS Operating License. Therefore, the proposed revision does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The proposed deletion of TS 2.8(8) pertaining to fuel handling cranes, deletion of TS 2.11 pertaining to overhead cranes in the Containment and Auxiliary Buildings and deletion of statements in the bases of TS 2.8 pertaining to crane interlocks does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. Specifications 2.8(8), 2.11 and the deleted statements in the bases of Specification 2.8 do not need to be retained in the TS based upon Criteria 1 through 4 of the ''Final Policy Statement on Technical Specifications Improvements for Nuclear Power Reactors,'' dated July 22, 1993.

The requirements of Specification 2.8(8) and restrictions of Specification 2.11 are currently contained in Station procedures to ensure that the handling of fuel assemblies, CEAs and heavy loads is accomplished safely and effectively. These revisions make the FCS Technical Specifications more similar to STS, which do not contain requirements or restrictions concerning the operation of fuel handling cranes or overhead cranes.

The proposed revision to TS 3.2, Table 3-5, Item 1, is an administrative revision to the frequency of CEA drop time testing. The proposed frequency is the most appropriate time to perform the surveillance to ensure that the CEAs drop into the core within the time specified in the safety analysis and is identical to the frequency specified in STS 3.1.5.7. Therefore, the proposed revision does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The proposed deletion of TS 3.2, Table 3-5, Item 5, which currently requires testing the refueling system interlocks prior to the refueling outage does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. Table 3-5, Item 5, does not need to be retained in the TS based upon Criteria 1 through 4 of the ''Final Policy Statement on Technical Specifications Improvements for Nuclear Power Reactors,'' dated July 22, 1993. The requirements for testing refueling system interlocks are currently contained in Station procedures. This revision makes the FCS Technical Specifications more similar to STS, which do not contain requirements or restrictions pertaining to testing refueling system interlocks.

The proposed revision to TS 3.2, Table 3-5, Item 10, ensures consistent use of terminology among the frequencies specified in Table 3-5. The proposed revision clarifies the wording and introduces additional operational flexibility such that the surveillance could be performed before 720 hours of system operation if warranted by plant conditions or beneficial to plant operation. Therefore, the proposed revision does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The remaining TS revisions are administrative in nature in that they correct references, titles, misspelling(s), and page numbers, or revise wording to be consistent with defined intervals within the TS. Therefore, they do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: W. Dale Clark Library, 215 South 15th Street, Omaha, Nebraska 68102

Attorney for licensee: LeBoeuf, Lamb, Leiby, and MacRae, 1875 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20009-5728

NRC Project Director: William H. Bateman

Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc., Docket Nos. 50-348 and 50-364, Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, Houston County, Alabama

Date of amendments request: March 6, 1995

Description of amendments request: The proposed amendment would relocate the seismic and meteorological monitoring instrumentation from the Technical Specifications to the Final Safety Analysis Report in accordance with the ''Final Policy Statement on Technical Specifications Improvements for Nuclear Power Reactors,'' dated July 22, 1993.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. Does the proposed change involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

No. The proposed change relocates information from the TS to the FSAR and has no impact on physical plant operation or configuration. The continued capability of the seismic and meteorological instrumentation to perform its intended function will be ensured through controlled change processes governed by 10 CFR 50.59.

Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Does the proposed change create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

No. The sole function of the seismic and meteorological monitoring instrumentation is to record data. The proposed change will not involve any design change or modification to the plant. The proposed change will not alter the operation of the plant or the manner in which it is operated. Any subsequent change to the Seismic and Meteorological Monitoring Instrumentation requirements will undergo a review in accordance with the criteria of 10 CFR 50.59 to endure that the change does not involve an unreviewed safety question.

Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. Does the proposed change involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

No. The proposed change will relocate Seismic and Meteorological Monitoring Instrumentation requirements from the TS to licensee controlled documents subject to the criteria of 10 CFR 50.59. The proposed change will have no adverse impact on any protective boundary or safety limit.

Therefore, the proposed change will not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Houston-Love Memorial

Library, 212 W. Burdeshaw Street, Post Office Box 1369, Dothan, Alabama 36302

Attorney for licensee: M. Stanford Blanton, Esq., Balch and Bingham, Post Office Box 306, 1710 Sixth Avenue North, Birmingham, Alabama 35201

NRC Project Director: William H. Bateman

Tennessee Valley Authority, Docket Nos. 50-327 and 50-328, Sequoyah Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, Hamilton County, Tennessee

Date of amendment request: November 15, 1994; superseded March 7, 1995 (TS 94-12).

Description of amendment request: The proposed change would remove the frequency for each of the audits specified in the administrative controls section of the technical specifications (TS), except those related to the fire protection system. The requirements to perform the audits would be retained, but the frequency for their performance would be controlled by a requirement to be added to the Nuclear Quality Assurance Plan. This would require that the audits listed in the TS (except those related to the fire protection system) be performed on a biennial frequency. In addition, the proposed change would remove the requirement to perform site Radiological Emergency Plan, Physical Security Plan, and the Safeguard Contingency Plan reviews and audits from the TS, since these requirements presently exist in their respective Plans.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

The standards used to arrive at a determination that a Technical Specification change request involves no significant hazards consideration are included in the Commission's regulations, 10 CFR 50.92, which states that no significant hazards considerations are involved if the operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not: (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. Each standard is addressed as follows:

1. Operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed technical specifications would not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The likelihood that an accident will occur is neither increased or decreased by the Technical Specification change which only affects review and audit frequencies. This Technical Specification change will not impact the function or method of operation of plant equipment. Thus, there is not a significant increase in the probability of a previously analyzed accident due to this change. No systems, equipment, or components are affected by the proposed changes. Thus, the consequences of a malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the FSAR are not increased by this change.

The proposed change only affects review and audit frequencies. As such, the proposed change has no impact on accident initiators or plant equipment, and thus, does not affect the probabilities or consequences of an accident.

Therefore, we conclude that this change does not significantly increase the probabilities or consequences of an accident.

2. Operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed technical specifications would not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The proposed changes do not involve changes to the physical plant or operations. Since program audits do not contribute to accident initiation, a change related to audit functions cannot produce a new accident scenario or produce a new type of equipment malfunction. Also, this change does not alter any existing accident scenarios. The proposed change does not affect equipment or its operation, and, thus, does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident. Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident.

3. Operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed technical specifications would not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The proposed change concerning conduct of reviews and audits does not directly affect plant equipment or operation. Safety limits and limiting safety system settings are not affected by this proposed change.

Therefore, use of the proposed Technical Specification would not involve any reduction in the margin of safety.

The NRC has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on thisreview, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Chattanooga-Hamilton County Library, 1101 Broad Street, Chattanooga, Tennessee 37402

Attorney for licensee: General Counsel, Tennessee Valley Authority, 400 West Summit Hill Drive, ET 11H, Knoxville, Tennessee 37902

NRC Project Director: Frederick J. Hebdon

Virginia Electric and Power Company, Docket Nos. 50-338 and 50-339, North Anna Power Station, Units No. 1 and No. 2, Louisa County, Virginia

Date of amendment request: March 2, 1995

Description of amendment request: The proposed changes would revise Technical Specification 4.6.1.2.a to reference the testing requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, and to state that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission-approved exemptions to the applicable regulatory requirements are permitted.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

A discussion of these standards as they relate to this ... amendment request follows.

Criterion 1 - Does Not Involve a Significant Increase in the Probability or Consequences of an Accident Previously Evaluated.

The proposed change ... revises the North Anna Units 1 and 2 Technical Specification Surveillance Requirement 4.6.1.2.a to reference the testing frequency requirements of 10 CFR 50 Appendix J and to state that NRC approved exemptions to the applicable regulatory requirements are permitted. The current Technical Specification requires Type A tests be conducted in accordance with Appendix J to 10 CFR 50. The proposed administrative change simply includes the statement ''as modified by NRC-approved exemptions.'' No new requirements are added, nor are any existing requirements deleted. Any specific changes to the requirements of Appendix J will require a submittal from Virginia Electric and Power Company under 10 CFR 50.12 and subsequent review and approval by the NRC prior to implementation. The proposed change is stated generically to avoid the need for further Technical Specification changes if different exemptions are approved in the future.

The proposed change, in itself, does not affect reactor operations or accident analyses and has no radiological consequences. The change provides clarification so that future Technical Specifications changes will not be necessary to correspond to applicable NRC-approved exemptions from the requirements of Appendix J. This exemption request is consistent with the intent of the regulation.

Therefore, this proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of any accident previously evaluated.

Criterion 2 - Does Not Create the Possibility of a New or Different Kind of Accident from any Previously Evaluated.

The proposed Technical Specification amendment for Units 1 and 2 provides clarification to a specification that paraphrases a codified requirement.

Since the ... proposed Technical Specifications change would not change the

design, configuration, or method of operation of the plant, the changes would not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

Criterion 3 - Does Not Involve a Significant Reduction in the Margin of Safety.

The proposed North Anna Units 1 and 2 Technical Specifications change is administrative and clarifies the relationship between the requirements of Technical Specification Surveillance Requirement 4.6.1.2.a, Appendix J, and any approved exemptions to Appendix J. It does not, in itself, change a Safety Limit or a Limiting Condition for Operation. The NRC will directly approve any proposed change or exemption to Appendix J prior to implementation.

Therefore, this change does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: The Alderman Library, Special Collections Department, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia 22903-2498.

Attorney for licensee: Michael W. Maupin, Esq., Hunton and Williams, Riverfront Plaza, East Tower, 951 E. Byrd Street, Richmond, Virginia 23219.

NRC Project Director: David B. Matthews

Virginia Electric and Power Company, Docket Nos. 50-280 and 50-281, Surry Power Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Surry County, Virginia

Date of amendment request: November 10, 1994

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment request will clarify the surveillance requirements for the reactor protection and the engineered safeguards system instrumentation and actuation logic.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

Operation of Surry Power Station in accordance with the proposed Technical Specifications change will not:

1. Involve a significant increase in the probability of occurrence or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change to clarify the surveillance requirements for the Reactor Protection and Engineered Safeguards Systems instrumentation and actuation logic has no impact on the probability of an accident occurrence. The instrumentation and actuation logic will continue to be operated in the same manner. The actual test frequency is not changing. Rather, surveillance requirements are being clarified to represent the actual testing and the licensing and design bases. Testing of these instruments and actuation logic are presently design limited and would otherwise require using temporary modifications to complete the testing. Since the testing is not changing, the clarification of the actual testing does not contribute to the probability of any previously analyzed accident. The Reactor Protection and Engineered Safeguards Systems instrumentation and actuation logic will be operated in the same manner and the system operability requirements are not being altered. Therefore, the consequences of any design basis accident are not being increased by the proposed change to clarify the surveillance test requirements for the Reactor Protection and Engineered Safeguards System instrumentation and actuation logic.

2. Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

There are no plant modifications or changes in methods of plant operation introduced by this change in the clarification of the testing for the Reactor Protection and Engineered Safeguards Systems instrumentation and actuation logic. The plant is not being operated or tested in a different manner due to the proposed change. Therefore, no new accidents or accident precursors are generated by the proposed change to clarify the surveillance test requirements.

Clarifying the surveillance test requirements to represent the original licensing design basis and test conditions does not create the possibility of a new or different accident than previously analyzed.

3.Involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Clarification of the testing for the Reactor Protection and Engineered Safeguards Systems instrumentation and actuation logic surveillance requirements does not affect the margin of safety in that the operability requirements for these safety systems remain unchanged. The existing testing is performed in accordance with plant design and licensing basis and provides adequate indication of the operability of the affected instrumentation or actuation logic. The Reactor Protection and Engineered Safeguards Systems instrumentation and actuation logic are fully tested on a refueling cycle basis which includes complete operation of each relay and end device. Therefore, the margin of safety is not altered by the proposed clarification of the testing for the Reactor Protection and Engineered Safeguards Systems instrumentation and actuation logic.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Swem Library, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia 23185.

Attorney for licensee: Michael W. Maupin, Esq., Hunton and Williams, Riverfront Plaza, East Tower, 951 E. Byrd Street, Richmond, Virginia 23219.

NRC Project Director: David B. Matthews

Virginia Electric and Power Company, Docket Nos. 50-280 and 50-281, Surry Power Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Surry County, Virginia

Date of amendment request: November 22, 1994

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment request would delete unnecessary descriptive phrases regarding the number of cells in the station and emergency diesel generator batteries.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

The deletion of the descriptive references regarding the number of cells in the station and emergency diesel generator batteries is an administrative change and therefore does not:

1. Involve an increase in the probability of occurrence or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change to delete the descriptive references associated with the station and emergency diesel generator batteries (60 cell or 56 cell, respectively) has no impact on the probability of an accident occurrence. The change is administrative in nature and therefore does not affect the operation of the units. The batteries will continue to be operated in the same manner as before the change with operability based on design voltage and capacity requirements necessary to ensure safety functions can be performed. Prescribed surveillance testing will continue to ensure the operability of individual battery cells. Consequently, the proposed change does not contribute to the probability of occurrence or consequences of any design basis accident.

2. Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

This is an administrative change to delete the descriptive references associated with the station and emergency diesel generator batteries. There are no plant modifications being implemented by the proposed change and plant operations are not being changed. Provided the required design voltage and capacity are maintained, the batteries remain fully operable and capable of performing their intended safety functions. Individual battery cell surveillance requirements remain unchanged. Therefore, no new accidents or accident precursors are created by the proposed change.

3. Involve a reduction in a margin of safety as defined in the Technical Specifications.

The proposed administrative change to delete the descriptive references associated with the station and emergency diesel generator batteries (60 cell or 56 cell, respectively) is administrative in nature. Provided the required design voltage and capacity are maintained, the batteries remain fully operable and capable of performing their intended safety functions as assumed in the safety analyses. Individual battery cell surveillance requirements remain unchanged. Therefore, the analyzed margin of safety is not reduced by the proposed change.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Swem Library, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia 23185.

Attorney for licensee: Michael W. Maupin, Esq., Hunton and Williams, Riverfront Plaza, East Tower, 951 E. Byrd Street, Richmond, Virginia 23219.

NRC Project Director: David B. Matthews

Virginia Electric and Power Company, Docket Nos. 50-280 and 50-281, Surry Power Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Surry County, Virginia

Date of amendment request: January 24, 1995

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment request would increase the current Technical Specification pressurizer safety valve lift setpoint acceptance criterion from plus or minus 1% as-found and plus or minus 1% as-left to plus or minus 3% as-found and plus or minus 1% as-left.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

The proposed Technical Specifications change does not involve a significant hazards consideration because operation of Surry Units 1 and 2 in accordance with this change would not:

a. involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. Affected safety-related parameters were analyzed for a change to Surry Units 1 and 2 Technical Specification 3.1.A.3.b. It was determined that the primary and secondary side overpressure safety limits would not be exceeded in the most limiting overpressure transient (Loss of Load, Locker Rotor, and Rod Withdrawal events) with the pressurizer safety valve lift setpoint acceptance criterion increased to [plus or minus] 3%. The DNBR [departure from nucleate boiling ratio] results of transients impacted by the setpoint acceptance criterion increase are not affected by the proposed change. The increased setpoint acceptance criterion will not result in an inadvertent opening of the pressurizer safety valves. Since the proposed change involves no alterations to the physical plant, the probability of occurrence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated is not increased.

b. create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously identified. The proposed change to Surry Units 1 and 2 Technical Specification 3.1.A.3.b does not involve any alterations to the physical plant which would introduce any new or unique operational modes or accident precursors. Only the allowable tolerance about the existing setpoint will be changed.

c. involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. It was determined that the most limiting overpressure transients do not result in maximum pressures in excess of the primary and secondary side overpressure limits. The DNBR results of affected transients are not made more limiting by the proposed setpoint tolerance increase. Therefore, the margin of safety is unchanged by the proposed increase in the safety valve setpoint acceptance criterion.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Swem Library, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia 23185.

Attorney for licensee: Michael W. Maupin, Esq., Hunton and Williams, Riverfront Plaza, East Tower, 951 E. Byrd Street, Richmond, Virginia 23219.

NRC Project Director: David B. Matthews

Wolf Creek Nuclear Operating Corporation, Docket No. 50-482, Wolf Creek Generating Station, Coffey County, Kansas

Date of amendment request: March 21, 1995

Description of amendment request: The amendment would revise Surveillance Requirement 4.6.2.1.d for the containment spray system to change the surveillance interval for the performance of the air or smoke test through the containment spray header from once per 5 years to once per 10 years.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. The proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed reduced testing frequency of the Containment Spray System nozzles does not change the way the system is operated or the Containment Spray System's operability requirements. The proposed change to the surveillance frequency of safety equipment has no impact on the probability of an accident occurrence nor can it create a new or different type of accident. NUREG-1366 concluded that the corrosion of stainless steel piping is negligible during the extended surveillance interval. Since the Containment Spray System is maintained dry there is no additional mechanism that could cause blockage of the spray nozzles. Thus, the nozzles in the Containment Spray System will remain operable during the ten year surveillance interval to mitigate the consequence of an accident previously evaluated. No clogging or blockage of the nozzles in the Containment Spray System has been discovered during the performance of the five year surveillance tests. Therefore, the testing of the Containment Spray System[']s nozzles at the proposed reduced frequency will not increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. The proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

The proposed reduced frequency testing of the Containment Spray System nozzles does not change the way the Containment Spray System is operated. The reduced frequency of testing of the spray nozzles does not change plant operation or system readiness. The reduced frequency testing of the Containment Spray System nozzles does not generate any new accident precursors. Therefore, the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated is not created by the proposed changes in surveillance frequency of the Containment Spray System nozzles.

3. The proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

Reduced testing of the Containment Spray System nozzles does not change the way the system is operated or the Containment Spray System's operability requirements. NUREG-1366 concluded that the corrosion of stainless steel piping is negligible during the extended surveillance interval. Since the Containment Spray System is maintained dry there is no additional mechanism that could cause blockage of the Containment Spray System nozzles. Thus, the proposed reduced testing frequency is adequate to ensure spray nozzle operability. The surveillance requirements do not affect the margin of safety in the operability requirements of the Containment Spray System remains unaltered. The existing safety analysis remains bounding. Therefore no margins of safety are adversely affected by this proposed change.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are

satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room locations: Emporia State University, William Allen White Library, 1200 Commercial Street, Emporia, Kansas 66801 and Washburn University School of Law Library, Topeka, Kansas 66621

Attorney for licensee: Jay Silberg, Esq., Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037

NRC Project Director: William H. Bateman

Wolf Creek Nuclear Operating Corporation, Docket No. 50-482, Wolf Creek Generating Station, Coffey County, Kansas

Date of amendment request: March 24, 1995

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would add a new action statement to Technical Specification 3.5.1 which would provide a 72-hour allowed outage time (AOT) for one accumulator to be inoperable because its boron concentration did not meet the 2300-2500 parts per million (ppm) band. The amendment would also change the current allowed outage time for other reasons of inoperability from 1 hour to 24 hours.

Changes to the surveillance requirements are also proposed to incorporate the guidance of Generic Letter 93-05, ''Line-Item Technical Specifications Improvements to Reduce Surveillance Requirements for Testing During Operation.'' These proposed changes would base the operability of the accumulator on the contained water volume and cover pressure and would not require verification of the boron concentration after an accumulator volume increase, provided the source of the makeup water is the refueling water storage tank.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

(1) The proposed change does not involve a significant Increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The overall protection system performance will remain within the bounds of the accident analysis documented in Chapter 15 of the Updated Safety Analysis Report [USAR], WCAP-1096-P, and WCAP-11883 since no hardware changes are proposed.

The safety injection accumulators are credited in Section 15.6.5 of the Updated Safety Analysis Report for large and small break LOCA [loss-of-coolant accident]. There will be no effect on these analyses, or any other accident analysis, since the analysis assumptions are unaffected and remain the same as discussed in Section 15.6.5. Design basis accidents are not assumed to occur during allowed outage times covered by the Technical Specifications. As such, the ECCS [emergency core cooling system] Evaluation Model equipment availability assumptions made in Section 15.6.5 remain valid.

The safety injection accumulators will continue to function in a manner consistent with the above analysis assumptions and the plant design basis. As such, there will be no degradation in the performance of nor an increase in the number of challenges to equipment assumed to function during an accident situation.

The proposed technical specifications changes do not involve any hardware changes nor do they affect the probability of any event initiators. There will be no change to normal plant operating parameters, ESF [engineered safety features] actuation setpoints, accident mitigation capabilities, accident analysis assumptions or inputs. Therefore, these changes will not increase the probability of an accident or malfunction.

The corresponding increase in CDF [core damage frequency] due to the proposed change to increase the AOT of the accumulators from one hour to 24 hours is insignificant. Pursuant to the guidance in Section 3.5 of NSAC-125, the proposed increase in AOT does not ''degrade below the design basis the performance of a safety system assumed to function in the accident analysis,'' nor does it ''increase challenges to safety systems assumed to function in the accident analysis such that safety system performance is degraded below the design basis without compensating effects.'' Therefore, it is concluded that these changes do not increase the probability of occurrence of a malfunction of equipment important to safety.

(2) The proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

The proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. This change is administrative in nature and does not involve any change to the installed plant systems or the overall operating philosophy of WCGS [Wolf Creek Generating Station].

No new accident scenarios, transient precursors, failure mechanisms, or limiting single failures are introduced as a result of these proposed changes. There will be no adverse effect or challenges imposed on any safety-related system as a result of these changes. Therefore, the possibility of a new or different type of accident is not created.

There are no changes which would cause the malfunction of safety-related equipment, assumed to be operable in the accident analyses, as a result of the proposed technical specification changes. No new mode failure has been created and no new equipment performance burdens are imposed. Therefore, the possibility of a new or different malfunction of safety-related equipment is not created.

(3) The proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

The proposed change does not involve an significant reduction in a margin of safety. There will be no change to the Departure from Nucleate Boiling Ratio (DNBR) Correlation Limit, the design DNBR limits, or the safety analysis DNBR limits discussed in Bases Section 2.1.1.

As discussed previously, the performance of the accumulators will remain within the assumptions used in the large and small break LOCA analyses, as presented in USAR Section 15.6.5. Also, there will be no effect on the manner in which safety limits or limiting safety system settings are determined nor will there be any effect on those plant systems necessary to assure the accomplishment of protection functions.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room locations: Emporia State University, William Allen White Library, 1200 Commercial Street, Emporia, Kansas 66801 and Washburn University School of Law Library, Topeka, Kansas 66621

Attorney for licensee: Jay Silberg, Esq., Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037

NRC Project Director: William H. Bateman

Previously Published Notices Of Consideration Of Issuance Of Amendments To Facility Operating Licenses, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, And Opportunity For A Hearing

The following notices were previously published as separate individual notices. The notice content was the same as above. They were published as individual notices either because time did not allow the Commission to wait for this biweekly notice or because the action involved exigent circumstances. They are repeated here because the biweekly notice lists all amendments issued or proposed to be issued involving no significant hazards consideration.

For details, see the individual notice in the Federal Register on the day and page cited. This notice does not extend the notice period of the original notice.

Baltimore Gas and Electric Company, Docket No. 50-318, Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant, Unit No. 2, Calvert County, Maryland

Date of amendment request: February 24, 1995

Brief description of amendments: The proposed amendment would revise the Calvert Cliffs, Unit No. 2, Technical Specifications (TSs). Specifically, TS 4.G.1.2 would reference 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, directly, and any approved exemptions to the Type A testing frequency requirements, rather than paraphrase the regulation. The proposed wording is consistent with that used in NUREG-1432, ''Standard Technical Specifications - Combustion Engineering Plants,'' dated September 1992.Date of publication of individual notice in Federal Register: March 8, 1995 (60 FR 12789)

Expiration date of individual notice: April 7, 1995

Local Public Document Room location: Calvert County Library, Prince Frederick, Maryland 20678.

Duke Power Company, Docket Nos. 50-369 and 50-370, McGuire Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, Mecklenburg County, North Carolina

Date of amendment request: February 23, 1995, as supplemented March 21, 1995.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise Technical Specifications 3.8.2.1 and 3.8.3.1 to allow installation of a modification to replace the battery, main and tie breakers in response to an Electrical Distribution Systems Functional Inspection, conducted by the NRC in July 1991. The existing breaker arrangement could result in a trip of both the battery and main breakers if a fault occurs on one of the 125 VDC panelboards. The licensee committed to have these breakers replaced in 1995 with a better coordinated design to eliminate the concern.Date of publication of individual notice in Federal Register: March 8, 1995 (60 FR 12791)

Expiration date of individual notice: April 7, 1995

Local Public Document Room location: Atkins Library, University of North Carolina, Charlotte (UNCC Station), North Carolina.

Houston Lighting & Power Company, City Public Service Board of San Antonio, Central Power and Light Company, City of Austin, Texas, Docket No. 50-498, South Texas Project, Unit 1, Matagorda County, Texas

Date of amendment request: March 1, 1995

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would modify the steam generator tube plugging criteria in Technical Specification 3/4.4.5, Steam Generators, and the allowable leakage for Unit 1 in Technical Specification 3/4.4.6.2, Operational Leakage, and the associated Bases.Date of individual notice in the Federal Register: March 13, 1995 (60 FR 13478)

Expiration date of individual notice: April 12, 1995

Local Public Document Room location: Wharton County Junior College, J. M. Hodges Learning Center, 911 Boling Highway, Wharton, Texas 77488

Houston Lighting & Power Company, City Public Service Board of San Antonio, Central Power and Light Company, City of Austin, Texas, Docket No. 50-498, South Texas Project, Unit 1, Matagorda County, Texas

Date of amendment request: March 1, 1995

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would change Technical Specification 3/4.4.5, Steam Generators, and the associated Bases to allow the use of an alternate plugging criteria (known in the industry as F*) on steam generator tubes that are defective or degraded within certain areas within the tubesheet. Date of individual notice in the Federal Register: March 13, 1995 (60 FR 13481)

Expiration date of individual notice: April 12, 1995

Local Public Document Room location: Wharton County Junior College, J. M. Hodges Learning Center, 911 Boling Highway, Wharton, Texas 77488

Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation, Docket No. 50-410, Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, Unit 2, Oswego County, New York

Date of amendment request: March 9, 1994

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, Unit 2, Technical Specifications (TSs). Specifically, TS 4.6.1.2.a would be modified to allow the second Primary Containment Integrated Leakage Rate Test (Type A) to be performed at the fifth refueling outage (RF-05) or 72 months after the first Type A test instead of the fourth refueling outage (RF-04) as currently scheduled.

Date of publication of individual notice in Federal Register: March 23, 1995 (60 FR 15310)

Expiration date of individual notice: April 24, 1995

Local Public Document Room location: Reference and Documents Department, Penfield Library, State University of New York, Oswego, New York 13126.

Rochester Gas and Electric Corporation, Docket No. 50-244, R. E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant, Rochester, New York

Date of application for amendment: March 13, 1995

Brief description of amendment: The proposed amendment would revise Ginna Station Technical Specification (TS) 4.4.2.4.a to replace specific leakage testing frequencies for containment isolation valves. This TS change will support a proposed Exemption to Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR) Part 50, Appendix J, Section III.D.3, requested under separate cover to exempt Type C testing of certain valves during a 1995 refueling outage.

Date of publication of individual notice in Federal Register: March 22, 1995 (60 FR 15167)

Expiration date of individual notice: April 21, 1995

Local Public Document Room location: Rochester Public Library, 115 South Avenue, Rochester, New York 14610.

Notice Of Issuance Of Amendments To Facility Operating Licenses

During the period since publication of the last biweekly notice, the Commission has issued the following amendments. The Commission has determined for each of these amendments that the application complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations. The Commission has made appropriate findings as required by the Act and the Commission's rules and regulations in 10 CFR Chapter I, which are set forth in the license amendment.

Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for A Hearing in connection with these actions was published in the Federal Register as indicated.

Unless otherwise indicated, the Commission has determined that these amendments satisfy the criteria for categorical exclusion in accordance with 10 CFR 51.22. Therefore, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared for these amendments. If the Commission has prepared an environmental assessment

under the special circumstances provision in 10 CFR 51.12(b) and has made a determination based on that assessment, it is so indicated.

For further details with respect to the action see (1) the applications for amendment, (2) the amendment, and (3) the Commission's related letter, Safety Evaluation and/or Environmental Assessment as indicated. All of these items are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document rooms for the particular facilities involved.

Boston Edison Company, Docket No. 50-293, Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station,Plymouth County, MassachusettsDate of application for amendment: November 22, 1994

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises the allowable leak rate for the main steam isolation valves from the current 11.5 standard cubic feet per hour (scfh) for each valve, to a maximum combined main steam line leak rate of 46 scfh.

Date of issuance: March 22, 1995

Effective date: March 22, 1995

Amendment No.: 160

Facility Operating License No. DPR-35: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: January 18, 1995 (60 FR 3671) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 22, 1995. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: Plymouth Public Library, 11 North Street, Plymouth, Massachusetts 02360.

Boston Edison Company, Docket No. 50-293, Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station,Plymouth County, Massachusetts

Date of application for amendment: September 6, 1994, as supplemented February 15, 1995.

Brief description of amendment: This amendment revises Technical Specifications (TSs) 3.7.B.1.a, 3.7.B.1.c, 3.7.B.1.e, 3.7.B.2.a, and 3.7.B.2.c and adds Sections 3.7.B.1.f and 3.7.B.2.e. The additional section requires both trains of standby gas treatment and control room high efficiency air filtration system to be operable for the initiation of fuel movement. In the event either train becomes inoperable, the other train must be demonstrated to be operable within 2 hours and fuel handling operations may continue for 7 days with one train inoperable. Additionally, this change allows one train to be defined as operable without its associated emergency power supply, provided one source of normal power (startup transformer or unit auxiliary power) is available.

Date of issuance: March 22, 1995

Effective date: As of the date of issuance to be implemented within 30 days.

Amendment No.: 161

Facility Operating License No. DPR-35: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: October 26, 1994 (59 FR 53837) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 22, 1995. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: Plymouth Public Library, 11 North Street, Plymouth, Massachusetts 02360.

Boston Edison Company, Docket No. 50-293, Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station,Plymouth County, Massachusetts

Date of application for amendment: September 6, 1994

Brief description of amendment: This amendment would reduce the Reactor Pressure Setpoint at which the shutdown cooling system automatically isolates. This setpoint also isolates the low pressure coolant injection valves when the shutdown cooling system is in operation.

Date of issuance: March 27, 1995

Effective date: To be implemented within 30 days following restart from refueling outage ι10

Amendment No.: 162

Facility Operating License No. DPR-35: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: October 26, 1994 (59 FR 53837) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 27, 1995.No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: Plymouth Public Library, 11 North Street, Plymouth, Massachusetts 02360.

Carolina Power & Light Company, et al., Docket Nos. 50-325 and 50-324, Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, Units 1 and 2, Brunswick County,North Carolina

Date of application for amendments: October 28, 1994, as supplemented February 16, 1995.

Brief description of amendments: The proposed change will revise TS requirements to increase the surveillance test intervals and the allowable out of service times or instruments of the reactor protection system, isolation actuation system, emergency core cooling system actuation system, control rod withdrawal block system, control room emergency ventilation system, anticipated transient without scram, recirculation pump trip (RPT), end-of-cycle RPT, and the reactor core isolation cooling actuation system.

Date of issuance: March 30, 1995Effective date: March 30, 1995

Amendment Nos.: 175 and 206

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-71 and DPR-62. The amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: December 7, 1994 (59 FR 63114) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 30, 1995.No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: University of North Carolina at Wilmington, William Madison Randall Library, 601 S. College Road, Wilmington, North Carolina 28403-3297.

Carolina Power & Light Company, et al., Docket No. 50-400, Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1, Wake and Chatham Counties, North CarolinaDate of application for amendment: October 24, 1994, as supplemented December 6, 1994.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment allows the relocation of TS 3/4.3.4, Turbine Overspeed Protection and associated Bases to be consistent with the new Standard Technical Specifications for Westinghouse plants.

Date of issuance: March 22, 1995

Effective date: March 22, 1995

Amendment No. 55

Facility Operating License No. NPF-63. Amendment revises the Technical Specifications

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: November 23, 1994 (59 FR 60379) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 22, 1995.No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: Cameron Village Regional Library, 1930 Clark Avenue, Raleigh, North Carolina 27605.

Commonwealth Edison Company, Docket Nos. STN 50-454 and STN 50-455, Byron Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Ogle County, IllinoisDocket Nos. STN 50-456 and STN 50-457, Braidwood Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Will County, Illinois

Date of application for amendments: December 22, 1992

Brief description of amendments: These amendments add new requirements to the Technical Specifications (TS) to ensure that an Essential Service Water system (SX) pump and crossover path are available from a shutdown unit to serve as backup to an operating unit. In addition, a new TS is added to require the unit crosstie to be open, or capable of being opened, from the Main Control Room, whenever either, or both units are in an operating mode (MODE 1, 2, 3, or 4).

Date of issuance: March 20, 1995

Effective date: March 20, 1995

Amendment Nos.: 71, 71, 62, and 62

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-37, NPF-66, NPF-72 and NPF-77: The amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: February 3, 1993 (58 FR 6994) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 20, 1995. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: For Byron, the Byron Public Library, 109 N. Franklin, P.O. Box 434, Byron, Illinois 61010; for Braidwood, the Wilmington Township Public Library, 201 S. Kankakee Street, Wilmington, Illinois 60481.

Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Docket No. 50-247, Indian PointNuclear Generating Unit No. 2, Westchester County, New York

Date of application for amendment: September 19, 1994

Brief description of amendment: The amendment would revise Technical Specification Section 4.4.A.3, Frequency of Containment Integrated Leakage Rate Test, to reference 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, as modified by approved exemptions, directly.

Date of issuance: March 17, 1995

Effective date: As of the date of issuance to be implemented within 30 days

Amendment No.: 181

Facility Operating License No. DPR-26: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: February 15, 1995 (60 FR 8744) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 17, 1995.No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: White Plains Public Library, 100 Martine Avenue, White Plains, New York 10610.

Duquesne Light Company, et al., Docket Nos. 50-334 and 50-412, Beaver Valley Power Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Shippingport, PennsylvaniaDate of application for amendments: April 23, 1990, as supplemented January 21, 1992 and March 17, 1995.

Brief description of amendments: These amendments revise the Appendix A Technical Specifications (TSs) for Unit 1 and Unit 2 by (a) deleting TS Table 3.6-1, ''Containment Penetrations,'' (b) rewording TS Definition 1.8, ''Containment Integrity,'' and TSs 3.6.1.1, 3.6.1.2, 3.6.3.1, and 3.9.4 relating to containment integrity, containment leakage, containment isolation valves, and containment building penetrations respectively to account for the deletion of TS Table 3.6-1, and (c) correcting terminology by replacing the word ''door'' with ''hatch'' in TS 3.9.4.a.

The Unit 1 amendment also modifies TS Table 3.3-5, ''Engineered Safety Features Response Times,'' by changing the feedwater isolation response time to reflect total isolation times for the main feedwater regulating valve and bypass feedwater regulating valve. Minor editorial changes were also incorporated in TS Table 3.3-5.

Date of issuance: March 28, 1995

Effective date: March 28, 1995

Amendment Nos.: 185 and 66

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-66 and NPF-73: Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: June 27, 1990 (55 FR 26283), as supplemented April 1, 1992 (57 FR 11107) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 28, 1995. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: B. F. Jones Memorial Library, 663 Franklin Avenue, Aliquippa, Pennsylvania 15001.

GPU Nuclear Corporation, et al., Docket No. 50-219, Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Ocean County, New Jersey

Date of application for amendment: June 22, 1994

Brief description of amendment: The amendment changes Technical Specification (TS) Sections 1.6, 3.2.A, 3.9.f.5 and 4.2.A which specify the Shutdown Margin (SDM) requirements that ensure the reactor can be made subcritical and can be maintained sufficiently subcritical to preclude inadvertent criticality in any core condition. The amendment also includes a definition of Shutdown Margin, TS Section 1.45. Administrative changes to TS Sections 1.7 and 3.2.b.2(b) are also included to simplify definitions and eliminate unnecessary notes and references.

Date of Issuance: March 21, 1995Effective date: As of the date of issuance to be implemented within60 days

Amendment No.: 178

Facility Operating License No. DPR-16. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: July 20, 1994 (59 FR 37072) The Commission's related evaluation of this amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 21, 1995.No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Ocean County Library, Reference Department, 101 Washington Street, Toms River, NJ 08753.

Illinois Power Company and Soyland Power Cooperative, Inc., Docket No. 50-461, Clinton Power Station, Unit No. 1, DeWitt County, Illinois

Date of application for amendment: February 14, 1995

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises Technical Specification 3.8.2, ''AC Sources-Shutdown;'' 3.8.5, ''DC Sources-Shutdown;'' and 3.8.8, ''Inverters-Shutdown.'' The changes revise the operability requirements for the Division 3 diesel generator and the Division 3 and 4 batteries, battery chargers and inverters to apply only when the high pressure core spray system is required to be operable.

Date of issuance: March 21, 1995

Effective date: March 21, 1995

Amendment No.: 99

Facility Operating License No. NPF-62. The amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: February 17, 1995 (60 FR 9412) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 21, 1995.No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: The Vespasian Warner Public Library, 120 West Johnson Street, Clinton, Illinois 61727.

Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation, Docket No. 50-220, Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station Unit No. 1, Oswego County, New York

Date of application for amendment: June 30, 1994, as supplemented March 7, 1995

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises Technical Specification (TS) 3.2.7.1 to add 8 check valves to Table 3.2.7.1. These valves were installed to add additional protection of the low pressure Core Spray system from the high pressure Reactor Coolant system. Including the valves in the TSs will assure that the proper surveillance testing is done to maintain a high reliability for the valves to protect the Core Spray system.

Date of issuance: March 20, 1995

Effective date: As of the date of issuance to be implemented within 30 days.

Amendment No.: 154

Facility Operating License No. DPR-63: Amendment revises the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: August 3, 1994 (59 FR 39593) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 20, 1995.No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: Reference and Documents Department, Penfield Library, State University of New York, Oswego, New York 13126.

Northeast Nuclear Energy Company, et al., Docket No. 50-336, Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 2, New London County, Connecticut

Date of application for amendment: April 22, 1994

Brief description of amendment: The amendment deletes the operability and surveillance requirements of the condenser air ejector radiation monitor from the Millstone Unit 2 Technical Specification Tables 3.3-12 and 4.3-12.

Date of issuance: March 27, 1995

Effective date: As of the date of issuance to be implemented within 30 days

Amendment No.: 186

Facility Operating License No. DPR-65. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: May 25, 1994 (59 FR 27058) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 27, 1995. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Learning Resources Center, Three Rivers Community-Technical College, Thames Valley Campus, 574 New London Turnpike, Norwich, CT 06360.

Public Service Electric & Gas Company, Docket No. 50-354, Hope Creek Generating Station, Salem County, New Jersey

Date of application for amendment: March 31, 1994 and August 5, 1994

Brief description of amendment: This amendment revises: Technical Specification (TS) 3.8.1.1.b.2 which maintains diesel operability for a 48-hour period when the fuel storage system of one or more diesel generators contains less than a 7-day supply of fuel: TS 4.8.1.1.2.h.8 by deletion and replacement with surveillance requirement 4.8.1.1.2.k.1 which permits the 24-hour diesel generator endurance run to be performed in any operational condition; establish surveillance requirement 4.8.1.1.2.k.2 which allows the hot restart test to be conducted not only after surveillance requirement 4.8.1.1.2.k.1, but also after the diesel generator has operated between 4300 kw and 4400 kw for one hour or after any time the diesel generator operating temperature has stabilized; revise TS 3.8.1.1 to eliminate the requirements to start the Emergency Diesel Generator (EDG) with an inoperable offsite circuit(s) of AC electrical power; add a provision that eliminates required testing of remaining EDGs when one EDG is inoperable due to an inoperable support system or an independently testable component with no potential for common mode failure for the remaining EDGs. In addition, if testing of the EDGs is required, the surveillance will be performed within 16 hours instead of 24 hours as currently specified; delete the requirement to perform a Loss of Offsite Power (LOOP) test (Surveillance Requirement 4.8.1.1.2.h.b) following the 24-hour EDG endurance run test in its place, a hot restart test (no LOOP load sequencing) will be established.

Date of issuance: March 30, 1995

Effective date: March 30,1995

Amendment No.: 72

Facility Operating License No. NPF-57: This amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: June 8, 1994 (59 FR 29630) and October 12, 1994 (59 FR 51625) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 30, 1995. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: Pennsville Public Library, 190 S. Broadway, Pennsville, New Jersey 08070

South Carolina Electric & Gas Company, South Carolina Public ServiceAuthority, Docket No. 50-395, Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1, Fairfield County, South Carolina

Date of application for amendment: October 29, 1993, as supplemented on March 11, 1994, May 18, 1994, September 20, 1994, and October 20, 1994.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment changes Operating License NPF-12 to delete License Conditions 2.C.13, 2.C.14, and 2.C.32.

Date of issuance: March 29, 1995

Effective date: March 29, 1995

Amendment No.: 123

Facility Operating License No. NPF-12. Amendment revises the operating license.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: February 16, 1994 (59 FR 7698) and April 28, 1994 (59 FR 22012), as corrected June 30, 1994 (59 FR 33795). The May 18, 1994, September 20, 1994, and October 20, 1994, submittals provided supplemental and clarifying information that did not change the initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 29, 1995.No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: Fairfield County Library, 300 Washington Street, Winnsboro, SC 29180

Southern California Edison Company, et al., Docket Nos. 50-361 and 50-362, San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 2 and 3, San Diego County, California

Date of application for amendments: September 30, 1993, as supplemented by letters dated November 16, 1993, January 18, 1995, and February 2, 1995.

Brief description of amendments: These amendments revised the technical specifications to (1) divide item 7 of Tables 3.3-3, 3.3-4, 3.3-5, and 4.3-2 into item 7a that addresses the existing loss-of-voltage (LOV) function and item 7b that separately addresses the degraded grid voltage (DGV) function; (2) add footnote (d) to Table 3.3-3 to indicate that the DGV actuation relay logic is applicable in Modes 1, 2, 3, and 4 when the diesel generator circuit breaker is open; (3) replace the reference to Figure 3.3-1 in item 7a of Tables 3.3-4 and 3.3-5 with definite voltage and time values; (4) add note 9 to Table 3.3-5 to explain the response

time for an LOV signal; and (5) delete Figure 3.3-1, ''Degraded Bus Voltage Trip Setting,'' and the reference to this figure from Table 3.3-4.

Date of issuance: March 17, 1995

Effective date: Unit 2, as of the date of completion of the currrent refueling outage and must be fully implemented before the plant returns to power; Unit 3, as of the date of the completion of its next refueling outage and must be fully implemented before the plant returns to power.

Amendment Nos.: Unit 2 - Amendment No. 118; Unit 3 - Amendment No. 107

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-10 and NPF-15: The amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: November 10, 1993 (58 FR 59755). The additional information contained in the November 16, 1993, January 18, 1995 and February 2, 1995, letters was clarifying in nature, within the scope of the initial notice and did not affect the NRC staff's proposed no significant hazards consideration determination.The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 17, 1995.No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Main Library, University of California, P. O. Box 19557, Irvine, California 92713

Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc., Docket Nos. 50-348 and 50-364, Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, Houston County, Alabama.

Date of amendments request: January 9, 1995

Brief description of amendments: The amendments change the Technical Specifications to implement recommended changes from Generic Letter (GL) 93-05, ''Line Item Technical Specification Improvements to Reduce Surveillance Requirements for Testing During Power Operation,'' dated September 27, 1993. Specifically, the amendments implement TS changes corresponding to the following GL 93-05 line-item improvement issues and numbers: Control Rod Movement Test for Pressurized Water Reactors (4.2.1); Radiation Monitors (5.14); Surveillance of Boron Concentration in the Accumulator/Safety Injection/Core Flood Tank (7.1); Containment Spray System (8.1); Hydrogen Recombiner (8.5); and Special Test Exemptions (12).

Date of issuance: March 20, 1995

Effective date: March 20, 1995

Amendment Nos.: 113 and 104

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-2 and NPF-8. Amendments revise the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: February 15, 1995 (60 FR 8756) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 20, 1995.No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: Houston-Love Memorial Library, 212 W. Burdeshaw Street, Post Office Box 1369, Dothan, Alabama 36302

Toledo Edison Company, Centerior Service Company, and The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, Docket No. 50-346, Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 1, Ottawa County, Ohio

Date of application for amendment: December 6, 1994

Brief description of amendment: This amendment deletes Technical Specification (TS) Surveillance Requirement (SR) 4.1.3.2.2 for the Axial Power Shaping Rods and relaxes surveillance intervals for TS 3/4.1.3.1, ''Group Height - Safety and Regulating Rod Groups;'' TS 3/4.4.6.2, ''Operational Leakage;'' TS 3/4.5.2, ''ECCS Subsystems - Tavg equal to or greater than 280°F;'' TS 3/4.6.2.1, ''Containment Spray System;'' and TS 3/4.10.4, ''Special Test Exceptions Shutdown Margin.'' Date of issuance: March 21, 1995Effective date: March 21, 1995 and implemented not later than 90 days after issuance

Amendment No.: 196

Facility Operating License No. NPF-3. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: February 15, 1995 (60 FR 8757) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 21, 1995.No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: University of Toledo Library, Documents Department, 2801 Bancroft Avenue, Toledo, Ohio 43606.

Toledo Edison Company, Centerior Service Company, and The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, Docket No. 50-346, Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 1, Ottawa County, Ohio

Date of application for amendment: December 6, 1994

Brief description of amendment: This amendment revises Technical Specification (TS) 4.0.5, ''Applicability'' and its associated Bases to eliminate the need for NRC approval of relief requests prior to implementation and relaxes surveillance test intervals for TS 3/4.1.2.3, ''Reactivity Control Systems - Makeup Pump - Shutdown; TS 3/4.1.2.4, ''Reactivity Control Systems - Makeup Pumps - Operating; TS 3/4.1.2.6, Reactivity Control Systems - Boric Acid Pump - Shutdown; and TS 3/4.1.2.7, ''Reactivity Control System - Boric Acid Pumps - Operating'' from monthly to quarterly. Date of issuance: March 22, 1995

Effective date: March 22, 1995, and to be implemented within 90 days

Amendment No.: 197

Facility Operating License No. NPF-3. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: February 15, 1995 (60 FR 8758) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 22, 1995.No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: University of Toledo Library, Documents Department, 2801 Bancroft Avenue, Toledo, Ohio 43606.

Union Electric Company, Docket No. 50-483, Callaway Plant, Unit 1, Callaway County, Missouri

Date of application for amendment: December 9, 1994, as supplemented on December 22, 1994.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises the Technical Specification (TS) Surveillance Requirement 4.8.1.1.2f.7. The change removes the requirement to perform the hot restart test within 5 minutes of completing the 24-hour endurance test and places that requirement in a separate TS.

Date of issuance: March 20, 1995

Effective date: March 20, 1995, to be implemented within 30 days

Amendment No.: 95

Facility Operating License No. NPF-30. Amendment revises the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: February 1, 1995 (60 FR 6315) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 20, 1995. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Callaway County Public Library, 710 Court Street, Fulton, Missouri 65251.

Union Electric Company, Docket No. 50-483, Callaway Plant, Unit 1, Callaway County, Missouri

Date of application for amendment: August 4, 1994, as supplemented on March 14, 1995 and March 28, 1995.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment replaces Technical Specification (TS) 3/4.6.2.2, Spray Additive System, with a new TS 3/4.6.2.2 entitled Recirculation Fluid pH control (RFPC) System. The associated TS Surveillance Requirements and the Bases will also be revised. In addition, the Bases section for the Refueling Water Storage Tank (RWST) System will be revised.

Date of issuance: March 30, 1995

Effective date: March 30, 1995, to be implemented within 30 days

Amendment No.: 96

Facility Operating License No. NPF-30. Amendment revises the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: September 28, 1994 (59 FR 49440) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 30, 1995. The March 14, 1995, and March 28, 1995, letters provided supplemental information that did not change the initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Callaway County Public Library, 710 Court Street, Fulton, Missouri 65251.

Union Electric Company, Docket No. 50-483, Callaway Plant, Unit 1, Callaway County, Missouri

Date of application for amendment: September 8, 1994

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises the Technical Specification (TS) Bases Section 3/4.9 and changes Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR) Sections 9.1.3 ''Fuel Pool Cooling and Cleanup,'' 9.1.4 ''Fuel Handling System'' and 15.4.6 ''Chemical and Volume Control System Malfunction That Results in a Decrease in the Boron Concentration in the Reactor Coolant. The changes established procedural controls to address an unreviewed safety question.

Date of issuance: March 31, 1995

Effective date: March 31, 1995, to be implemented within 30 days

Amendment No.: 97

Facility Operating License No. NPF-30. Amendment revises the Technical Specification Bases and FSAR.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: March 1, 1995 (60 FR 11151) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 31, 1995. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Callaway County Public Library, 710 Court Street, Fulton, Missouri 65251.

Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corporation, Docket No. 50-271, Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station, Vernon, Vermont

Date of application for amendment: December 8, 1994, as supplemented by letter dated February 16, 1995.

Brief description of amendment: The proposed amendment would change Standby Gas Treatment Power Supply Requirements during refueling operations.

Date of issuance: March 23, 1995

Effective date: As of the date of issuance, to be implemented within 30 days

Amendment No.: 143

Facility Operating License No. DPR-28. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: February 15, 1995 (60 FR 8759) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 23, 1995.No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Brooks Memorial Library, 224 Main Street, Brattleboro, Vermont 05301.

Washington Public Power Supply System, Docket No. 50-397, Nuclear Project No. 2, Benton County, Washington

Date of application for amendment: October 31, 1994

Brief description of amendment: The amendment relocated requirements regarding safety/relief valve position indication instrumentation from the Technical Specifications to other licensee-controlled documents.

Date of issuance: March 27, 1995

Effective date: March 27, 1995, to be implemented prior to restart from the spring 1995 refueling outage

Amendment No.: 135

Facility Operating License No. NPF-21: The amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: December 21, 1994 (59 FR 65831) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 27, 1995.No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Richland Public Library, 955 Northgate Street, Richland, Washington 99352

Wisconsin Public Service Corporation, Docket No. 50-305, Kewaunee NuclearPower Plant, Kewaunee County, Wisconsin

Date of application for amendment: December 2, 1994

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises Kewaunee Nuclear Power Plant (KNPP) Technical Specification (TS) 3.2 by deleting the requirements for the charging pumps, high concentration boric acid in the boric acid storage tanks (BASTs), the boric acid transfer pumps, and boric acid heat tracing. Changes to TS 3.3 and Table TS 3.5.3 add requirements associated with the emergency core cooling system (ECCS) accumulators, remove the requirements associated with the boric acid storage tanks and increase the minimum required boron concentration in the refueling water storage tank (RWST). Additionally, the surveillance requirements involving the BASTs, associated valves and heat tracing located in Table TS 4.1-1, Table TS 4.1-2 and Section 4.5 have been deleted.

Date of issuance: March 28, 1995

Effective date: March 28, 1995, to be implemented within 20 days

Amendment No.: 116

Facility Operating License No. DPR-43. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: January 4, 1995 (60 FR 508). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 28, 1995. No significant hazards consideration comments received: None.

Local Public Document Room location: University of Wisconsin Library Learning Center, 2420 Nicolet Drive, Green Bay, Wisconsin 54301.

Notice Of Issuance Of Amendments To Facility Operating LicensesAnd Final Determination Of No Significant Hazards ConsiderationAnd Opportunity For A Hearing (Exigent Public Announcement Or Emergency Circumstances)

During the period since publication of the last biweekly notice, the Commission has issued the following amendments. The Commission has determined for each of these amendments that the application for the amendment complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules

and regulations. The Commission has made appropriate findings as required by the Act and the Commission's rules and regulations in 10 CFR Chapter I, which are set forth in the license amendment.

Because of exigent or emergency circumstances associated with the date the amendment was needed, there was not time for the Commission to publish, for public comment before issuance, its usual 30-day Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing.

For exigent circumstances, the Commission has either issued a Federal Register notice providing opportunity for public comment or has used local media to provide notice to the public in the area surrounding a licensee's facility of the licensee's application and of the Commission's proposed determination of no significant hazards consideration. The Commission has provided a reasonable opportunity for the public to comment, using its best efforts to make available to the public means of communication for the public to respond quickly, and in the case of telephone comments, the comments have been recorded or transcribed as appropriate and the licensee has been informed of the public comments.

In circumstances where failure to act in a timely way would have resulted, for example, in derating or shutdown of a nuclear power plant or in prevention of either resumption of operation or of increase in power output up to the plant's licensed power level, the Commission may not have had an opportunity to provide for public comment on its no significant hazards consideration determination. In such case, the license amendment has been issued without opportunity for comment. If there has been some time for public comment but less than 30 days, the Commission may provide an opportunity for public comment. If comments have been requested, it is so stated. In either event, the State has been consulted by telephone whenever possible.

Under its regulations, the Commission may issue and make an amendment immediately effective, notwithstanding the pendency before it of a request for a hearing from any person, in advance of the holding and completion of any required hearing, where it has determined that no significant hazards consideration is involved.

The Commission has applied the standards of 10 CFR 50.92 and has made a final determination that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. The basis for this determination is contained in the documents related to this action. Accordingly, the amendments have been issued and made effective as indicated.

Unless otherwise indicated, the Commission has determined that these amendments satisfy the criteria for categorical exclusion in accordance with 10 CFR 51.22. Therefore, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared for these amendments. If the Commission has prepared an environmental assessment under the special circumstances provision in 10 CFR 51.12(b) and has made a determination based on that assessment, it is so indicated.

For further details with respect to the action see (1) the application for amendment, (2) the amendment to Facility Operating License, and (3) the Commission's related letter, Safety Evaluation and/or Environmental Assessment, as indicated. All of these items are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room for the particular facility involved.

The Commission is also offering an opportunity for a hearing with respect to the issuance of the amendment. By May 12, 1995, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license and any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding and who wishes to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written request for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene. Requests for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's ''Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings'' in 10 CFR Part 2. Interested persons should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.714 which is available at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC and at the local public document room for the particular facility involved. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, designated by the Commission or by the Chairman of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the designated Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of a hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR 2.714, a petition for leave to intervene shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding, and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) the nature of the petitioner's right under the Act to be made a party to the proceeding; (2) the nature and extent of the petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; and (3) the possible effect of any order which may be entered in the proceeding on the petitioner's interest. The petition should also identify the specific aspect(s) of the subject matter of the proceeding as to which petitioner wishes to intervene. Any person who has filed a petition for leave to intervene or who has been admitted as a party may amend the petition without requesting leave of the Board up to 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, but such an amended petition must satisfy the specificity requirements described above.

Not later than 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, a petitioner shall file a supplement to the petition to intervene which must include a list of the contentions which are sought to be litigated in the matter. Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the petitioner shall provide a brief explanation of the bases of the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion which support the contention and on which the petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The petitioner must also provide references to those specific sources and documents of which the petitioner is aware and on which the petitioner intends to rely to establish those facts or expert opinion. Petitioner must provide sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendment under consideration. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle the petitioner to relief. A petitioner who fails to file such a supplement which satisfies these requirements with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

Those permitted to intervene become parties to the proceeding, subject to any limitations in the order granting leave to intervene, and have the opportunity to

participate fully in the conduct of the hearing, including the opportunity to present evidence and cross-examine witnesses. Since the Commission has made a final determination that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration, if a hearing is requested, it will not stay the effectiveness of the amendment. Any hearing held would take place while the amendment is in effect.

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Attention: Docketing and Services Branch, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, by the above date. Where petitions are filed during the last 10 days of the notice period, it is requested that the petitioner promptly so inform the Commission by a toll-free telephone call to Western Union at 1-(800) 248-5100 (in Missouri 1-(800) 342-6700). The Western Union operator should be given Datagram Identification Number N1023 and the following message addressed to (Project Director): petitioner's name and telephone number, date petition was mailed, plant name, and publication date and page number of this Federal Register notice. A copy of the petition should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, and to the attorney for the licensee.

Nontimely filings of petitions for leave to intervene, amended petitions, supplemental petitions and/or requests for a hearing will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer or the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that the petition and/or request should be granted based upon a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.714(a)(1)(i)-(v) and 2.714(d).

Northeast Nuclear Energy Company, Docket No. 50-245, MillstoneNuclear Power Station, Unit 1, New London County, Connecticut

Date of application for amendment: March 17, 1995

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises Technical Specification (TS) Surveillance Requirement 4.7.D.1.c.1 by replacing the once per quarter stroke test for containment isolation valves (CIVs) with the requirement that the CIVs be tested in accordance with the inservice testing program. In addition, there are some editorial changes, minor renumbering of subsections, to reflect the TS revisions.

Date of issuance: March 21, 1995

Effective date: As of the date of issuance to be implemented immediately

Amendment No.: 81

Facility Operating License No. DPR-21. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications. Public comments requested as to proposed no significant hazards consideration: No. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment, finding of emergency circumstances, and final determination of no significant hazards consideration are contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 21, 1995.

Local Public Document Room location: Learning Resource Center, Three Rivers Community-Technical College, Thames Valley Campus, 574 New London Turnpike, Norwich, CT 06360.

Attorney for licensee: Ms. L. M. Cuoco, Senior Nuclear Counsel, Northeast Utilities Service Company, Post Office Box 270, Hartford, CT 06141-0270.

NRC Project Director: Phillip F. McKee

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 5th day of April, 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Elinor G. Adensam,

Acting Director, Division of Reactor Projects - III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

[Doc. 95–8845 Filed 4–11–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–F

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

Notice of Request for Extension of INV Forms 40–44 Submitted to OMB for Clearance

AGENCY: Office of Personnel Management.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (title 44, U.S. Code, chapter 35), this notice announces the reclearance of forms used to request information by mail for use in OPM investigations. These investigations are conducted to determine suitability for Federal employment and/or the ability to hold a security clearance, as prescribed in Executive Orders 10450 and 10577 and 5 U.S.C. 3301.

INV Form 41, Investigative Request for Employment Data and Supervisor Information, is sent to former employers and/or supervisors; INV Form 42, Investigative Request for Personal Information, is sent to references; INV Form 43, Investigative Request for Educational Registrar and Dean of Students Record Data, is sent to educational institutions; and INV Form 44, Investigative Request for Law Enforcement Data, is sent to local law enforcement agencies. In order to accommodate sources for which the collection formats of INV Forms 41–44 are awkward or inappropriate, INV Form 40, General Request for Investigative Data, has been added to the collection.

It is estimated that 1,065,955 individuals will respond annually (186,408 to INV Form 40; 360,115 to INV Form 41; 284,160 to INV Form 42; 76,152 to INV Form 43; and 159,120 to INV Form 44), and that each will require approximately 5 minutes to complete the form, for a total burden of 88,830 hours. For copies of this proposal call Doris R. Benz on 703–908–8564.

DATES: Comments on this proposal should be received on or before May 12, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Send or deliver comments to—Joseph Lackey, OPM Desk Officer, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, New Executive Office Building, NW, Room 10235, Washington, DC 20503.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John J. Lafferty, 202–376–3800.

Office of Personnel Management.

James B. King,

Director.

[FR Doc. 95–8975 Filed 4–11–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6325–01–M

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Rel. Nos. 33–7156; 34–35572]

Changes and Corrections to EDGAR Phase-In List

AGENCY: Securities and Exchange Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Commission is publishing a list of changes and corrections to the EDGAR phase-in list for companies whose filings are processed by the Division of Corporation Finance.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Sylvia J. Reis, Assistant Director, CF EDGAR Policy, Division of Corporation Finance at (202) 942–2940.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In connection with the adoption of the final rules fully implementing the